



**Fw: Reject Phillips 66 train terminal project at Nipomo**

**Debbie Arnold** to: Ramona Hedges

Sent by: **Jennifer Caffee**

02/04/2016 01:27 PM

**Debbie Arnold**

Supervisor, 5th District  
San Luis Obispo County  
(805) 781-4339

----- Forwarded by Jennifer Caffee/BOS/COSLO on 02/04/2016 01:27 PM -----

From: Paula Baker <ciaopaula@gmail.com>  
To: planning@co.slo.ca.us  
Date: 02/01/2016 10:22 AM  
Subject: Reject Phillips 66 train terminal project at Nipomo

---

Department of Planning and Building  
San Luis Obispo County  
976 Osos Street, Room 300  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

**Dear Planning Commissioners and Supervisors,**

**I urge you to reject the proposal by Phillips 66 to construct a train terminal project to bring oil tanker trains to the Santa Maria Refinery in Nipomo.**

The Phillips 66 oil rail transport and storage project would permit millions of gallons of toxic crude oil to be shipped by rail through California cities, from Chico, to Sacramento, through Bay Area cities and San Jose, and southward to the Santa Maria Refinery in Nipomo. Along its route for the life of the operation, the project would subject millions of Californians to risks of derailments, spills, fires, and explosions.

On January 25, a staff report from the Planning Commission of San Luis Obispo County recommended DENIAL of Phillips 66 proposal to deliver by oil train and refine tar sands oil at its refinery in Nipomo. The Findings for Denial cite multiple reasons for the recommendation. Among its 34 citations: increased cancer risks resulting from degraded air quality, hazards posed to endangered plant and animal species, loss of buffer zones separating industry from residential areas, risks to archaeological resources from a spill, and risks to communities along the main rail line posed by tanker car explosions. Some of these risks cannot be mitigated because of Federal preemption, which does not require the use of cleaner equipment or safer conditions of rail transportation.

Further, this staff report states:

"There are insufficient specific, overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project that outweigh the significant effects on the environment, as would be required to approve the project..."

Please reject this reckless and dangerous project.

Thank you,  
Paula Baker